DOD Evaluation Committee Briefing - 27 September 1979

1. Introduction/Background

    a. Tasking and my background
    b. Early visits to SRI and AMSAA

2. Mission

3. SRI Visit: 15-17 Nov

    a. Initial orientation
    b. Work statement/training
    c. Criteria for selection of subjects

| | |
|---|---|
| Well thought of | Adventurous |
| Above average intel | Open minded |
| Thinks well of himself | Successful |
| Articulate | Muture and stable |
| "Artistic" | |

    d. Witnessed session

4. SRI Visit: 12-15 Dec

    a. Screening potential subjects
    b. Review recent SRI experiments
    c. Review of tapes
    d. Relationship of subject/interviewer
    e. Role of outbound team
    f. Factors that inhibit success

        (1) Prior knowledge of target possibilities
        (2) Absence of feedback
        (3) Doing trivial tasks
        (4) Use of repetitive target sequences

    g. Factors that enhance success

        (1) Interest factor
        (2) Seriousness of purpose
        (3) Monitor/interviewer to ask questions
        (4) Practice with feedback

5. Selection of Individuals: Target: 3 individuals

    a. Considered - 251
    b. Interviewed - 117
    c. Initial Results - 30-35 potential candidates
    d. 14 Feb - SRI visited - results
    e. Intelligence background of individuals

Incl 2

6. Began training late Feb - stopped March

7. Training with SRI - 13 May
   Second phase of training just started

8. Training problems

   a. Environment
   b. Work related situations
   c. Availability
   d. Frequency
   e. Time of day

9. Target Selection Process

10. Current Program(s)

    a. Training at SRI
    b. "Beacon" situations
    c. Coordinate work - 3 levels
    d. "Real" situations
    e. CDEC training

11. Development of TCC

12. Future Objectives:

    a. Continue development of individual abilities
    b. Complete training at SRI (Dec 79)
    c. Apply RV techniques to "live problems"
    d. Determine tasking procedures
    e. Align resources properly

13. Evaluation Report

MISSION STATEMENT


(S/ORCON)  To establish a program using psychoenergics for intelligence applications.  Specifically, utilizing that field of psychoenergics referred to as REMOTE VIEWING.  The program encompasses the following:

- Establishing a training program in REMOTE VIEWING utilizing selected INSCOM personnel.

- Establishing procedures for intelligence collection techniques utilizing REMOTE VIEWING.

- Establishing a mechanism for responding to intelligence collection requirements (tasking) using REMOTE VIEWING.


CLASSIFIED BY: Director, DIA
DECLASSIFY ON: 17 Mar 99
EXTENDED BY: Director, DIA
REASON: 2-301-C (3) (6)

TARGET SELECTION PROCESS

A. TARGETS

    1. Location
    2. Activity
    3. Time

B. METHOD OF TARGETING

    1. Beacon (Human and objects)

        a. Initial target pool
        b. Random (local)
        c. Operational designate (i.e. A6E)

    2. Geographic Coordinates

        a. Target Pool

            (1) "Fun Targets"/Initial Orientation
            (2) Series 200 Map Targets
            (3) TK Targets

        b. Operational Designate

    3. UTM Coordinates

C. DEVELOPMENT OF TARGETS

    1. Beacon - Initial Target Pool

        a. 50 Targets selected by individual outside project.
        b. Secured by another individual.
        c. How utilized.

    2. Beacon - Random

    3. Operational Designate

    4. Geographic Coordinates -- "Fun Targets"

        a. Pool designed by NCOIC
        b. Stored in Safe -- Access limited

    5. Geographic Coordinates - Series 200 Map Targets

        a. Pool designed by Project Manager
        b. Stored in Safe - Access limited

6. Geographic Coordinates - TK Targets

    a. Pool designed by IIPD
    b. Stored in SSO Area -- Access controlled by SSO.

7. Geographic Coordinates -- Operational Designate

    a. "Customer" Request
    b. Data stored in safe - access controlled by Project Manager.

8. UTM Coordinates

    a. Weekly targets provided by CDEC
    b. Data controlled by COL Moses, CDEC

PROJECT STATUS

Week Ending / /

CUT-OFF 18 SEP 79

(3)

| Target Identification | Date Assigned | Viewer | Interviewer | Analyst | No. of Sessions | TC Range | Target Cue or Beacon Type | Past | Present | Future | Status | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SG1A | 10AUG | ALL | ALL | N/A | 9 | 1-3 | UTM/EVENT | X | X | | ON-GOING | TRNG ONLY |
| | 1SEP | ALL | ALL | AS ASSIGNED | 4 | | GEO | X | | | ON-GOING | TRNG ONLY |
| | 26SEP | 8 5 | TBD | TBD | | | TBD | | | | | OACSI SPECIAL |
| | TBD | 3 1 | F | S | | | TBD | | | | AWAIT INFO FROM SSD, 902D MI GP | |
| | 10SEP | 5 7 | S | 8 | 1 | | TBD | | | | ON-GOING | (1) C51 , 13 SEP 79 |
| | 3SEP | 6 | F | 3 | 4 | | GEO/POLAR | X | | | DATA UNDERGOING ANALYSIS | (1) C47, 7SEP, (2) C53 /4SEP (3) C54, /4SEP, (4) C55, /4SEP |
| | TBD | 3,6 1,8 | F&S | TBD | | | TBD | | | | AWAITING INITIAL GUIDANCE | |

TARGET CORRELATION CHART (TCC)*

| ASSIGNED VALUE | DESCRIPTION | RATING |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Absolutely no target correlation. | None (0%) |
| 2 | Drawings, narrative, and feedback reaction have minimal target correlation. | Low (15%) |
| 3 | Increased target correlation, identity of target could not be determined. | Low-Moderate (30%) |
| 4 | Many target correlation factors readily recognizable. Target identity possibilities narrowed. | Moderate (50%) |
| 5** | RV data shows unmistakable correlation to the target. Target possibilities can now be typified. | Moderate-Hig (70%) |
| 6 | Little or no extraneous RV data present. Target identity can be readily matched. | High (80%) |
| 7 | Correct naming of the target. | Direct Hit (100%) |

*Target Correlation Chart (TCC) was established not to prove
or disprove Remote Viewing (RV), rather, it was designed to
measure RV learning trends and to provide Project Management
personnel a readily available management tool.

**Current state-of-the-art indicates this level of expertise
is the norm for an experienced Remote Viewer.

CLASSIFIED BY: Director, DIA
DECLASSIFY ON:  31 May 99
EXTENDED BY: Director, DIA
REASON: 2-301-C (3) (6)

GRILL FLAME

TARGET CORRELATION RATINGS

| ASSIGNED VALUE | TOTAL |
|----------------|-------|
| 1 | 40 |
| 2 | 48 |
| 3 | 36 |
| 4 | 6 |
| 5 | 2 |
| 6 | 1 |
| 7 | 0 |
| Not rated | 9 |
| Not graded | 1 |
| TOTAL | 143 |

NOTE: 60 sessions adversely influenced by noise or work related problems.